Exhibit 3



503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, California 94117-2212 Telephone (415) 913-7800 Facsimile (415) 759-4112

MISSION STATEMENT

The Lexington Law Group is a public interest law firm specializing in consumer protection, antitrust and environmental litigation. We bring creativity and tenacity to plaintiff's public interest litigation in a manner that yields superb results for our clients and the general public. Our cases have resulted in the recovery of millions of dollars for the benefit of consumers and the removal of toxic chemicals from thousands of everyday products.

Our firm is made up of committed people who are passionate about our work. We represent aggrieved individuals, non-profit organizations, and public entities. We are dedicated to our clients and the public interest goals that we set for each case. Our exceptional grasp of complex legal issues enables us to obtain extraordinary results for our clients.

We are aggressive litigators who fight for our clients at every turn, yet we are also professional in our approach and treat all parties with respect. Our goal is to hold corporations accountable and to use the law to forge creative solutions to difficult problems for the benefit of our clients and society.

CURRENT CASES

The following is a list of representative cases we are currently litigating:

- Out-of-Network UCR Rates Litigation: Named interim Class Counsel in antitrust case against WellPoint alleging conspiracy to artificially reduce reimbursements on "out of network" claims by policy holders through the use of the fraudulent Ingenix database. (*In Re WellPoint Out-of-Network UCR Rates Litigation, MDL 2074*).
- <u>Fake Organic Cosmetic Products Litigation</u>: Class counsel in cases involving misrepresentation of non-organic cosmetic products as organic. (*Brown, et al. v. Hain Celestial Group*, CV-11-03082 LB (N.D. CA); *Golloher, et al. v. Todd Christopher International*, RG 12 653621 (Alameda Sup. Ct.)).
- <u>Fake "Naturals" Cosmetic Litigation</u>: Class counsel in case involving false and misleading representations that certain Neutrogena cosmetic products are natural. (*Stephenson, et al. v. Neutrogena Corp.*, C 12-00426 JCS).
- <u>Lead in Jewelry</u>: Environmental enforcement action co-litigated with the California Attorney General that has thus far resulted in commitments by hundreds of major retailers, importers and manufacturers of costume jewelry to significantly reduce the levels of lead in their jewelry. This case also lead directly to California's landmark lead in jewelry statute, which was itself a precursor to passage of the federal Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act. (*State of California v. Burlington Coat Factory, et al.*).

RESULTS

The following is a representative list of some of our past successes:

- <u>Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Interference</u>: Named Class Counsel in class action against Comcast for alleged breach of contract and false advertising arising from interference with subscribers' use of peer-to-peer file sharing applications. Obtained \$16 million settlement for the class. (*In re: Comcast Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Transmission Contract Litigation*).
- <u>Blue Shield Mid-Year Cost Increases</u>: Named Class Counsel in class action alleging breach of contract and false advertising case challenging health insurer Blue Shield of California's mid-year unilateral increase to deductibles and other calendar year costs. Obtained \$2.7 million settlement for the class. (*Dervaes v. Blue Shield of California*).
- <u>Chase Bank Debt Collection Practices</u>: Named Class Counsel in class action against Chase Bank alleging violations of Federal Debt Collection Practices Act and California's Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act in connection with Chase's credit card collection activities. (*Gardner v. Chase Bank USA, N.A.*).
- <u>Greenwashing of Consumer Products</u>: Counsel for non-profit group in private attorney general action resulting in Consent Judgments entered against more than 30 manufacturers and re-sellers requiring compliance with California's marketing and labeling requirements for cosmetic products. Examples of brands which have agreed to Court-ordered compliance with these requirements include Alterna, Aubrey, Beauty Without Cruelty, Blum Naturals, Boots, Curls, Derma E, Episencial, Kiss My Face, Morrocco Method, Nature's Baby, Organic Root Stimulator, Out of Africa, Pacifica, Palmer's, Parnevu, Peter Lamas, Pure & Basic, Shea Moisture, Simply Organic, Suki and Tints of Nature. (Center for Environmental Health v. Advantage Research et al.).
- <u>False Advertising of Anti-Aging Products</u>: Successfully prosecuted consumer protection action against maker of multi-million dollar "snake oil" product line falsely advertised as anti-aging cancer cure. (*Center for Environmental Health v. Almon Glenn Braswell*).
- <u>Lead in Diaper Rash Ointment</u>: Class action and private attorney general case that forced more than twenty-five major manufacturers and retailers of diaper rash ointment to reformulate their products to eliminate actionable levels of lead. Defendants included Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., Pfizer, Inc., Schering-Plough HealthCare Products, Inc., and Warner-Lambert Company. (*Center for Environmental Health v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., et al., and Kenneth Johnson et al. v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., et al.*).
- <u>US Airways Lap Child Litigation</u>: Recovered refunds in a successful consumer class action case alleging that US Airways charged for "lap-children" in breach of its contract of carriage. (*Robins v. US Airways, Inc.*).

- <u>Microsoft Technical Support Litigation</u>: Class action consumer case against Microsoft forcing Microsoft to abandon its unilateral decision to discontinue free technical support for Office 2000 software products. (*Jones v. Microsoft Corporation*).
- <u>Automobile Credit Truth-In-Lending Violations</u>: Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel in a large multi-party coordinated proceeding against hundreds of automobile dealerships alleging violations of the Truth in Lending Act that resulted in injunctions requiring disclosure of previously undisclosed lease and finance terms in automobile advertising. (*In Re Automobile Advertising Cases*).
- <u>Nursing Home Staffing Litigation</u>: Class action and private attorney general lawsuits against dozens of skilled nursing facilities that resulted in agreements to increase minimum staffing levels as required by California law. (*Foundation Aiding the Elderly v. Covenant Care, et al.*).
- <u>Health Risks From Kava Kava</u>: Represented class of consumers of Kava Kava dietary supplements against more than thirty-five defendants in case about failure to disclose the risk of liver disease from the products. (*In Re: Kava Kava Litigation*).
- <u>Second Hand Smoke</u>: Represented the City of San Jose and a private plaintiff in suit against major tobacco companies regarding failure to warn about second hand smoke in violation of California law. (*In Re Tobacco Cases II*).
- <u>Tobacco Advertising</u>: Represented non-profit group in case against outdoor advertising company defendants alleging violations of California's STAKE Act, which prohibits tobacco advertising within 1,000 feet of public schools, that resulted in the removal of hundreds of tobacco billboards located near schools in California. (*Center For Environmental Health v. Eller Media Corporation, et al.*).

ATTORNEY BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

Eric S. Somers specializes in complex consumer, antitrust and environmental public interest litigation. Mr. Somers recently represented a class of consumers in a case against a major paint manufacturer alleging a manufacturing defect that resulted in nationwide relief for aggrieved consumers. He represented a group of plaintiffs in a case against major inkjet printer manufacturers regarding false and misleading print speed representations and he was plaintiff's counsel in a successful class action case alleging violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act against Chase Bank. Mr. Somers was also Liaison Counsel in a complex coordinated proceeding alleging violations of the Truth In Lending Act by California automobile dealers that resulted in industry wide changes in advertising practices.

Mr. Somers also has significant experience enforcing California's landmark Right-to-Know law, Proposition 65, against Fortune 500 companies in the tobacco, pharmaceutical, chemical, cosmetics, water quality, costume jewelry and retail industries. These cases have led to reformulation of thousands of products designed for children to eliminate toxic

chemicals such as lead, arsenic, toluene, di-n-butyl phthalate (DBP) and di-2-ethylhexyl phthalate (DEHP). Examples of consumer products that have been reformulated include children's playsets (arsenic treated wood), water filters (lead and arsenic) and children's jewelry (lead). Many of these private enforcement actions have been co-litigated with the California Attorney General and other public enforcement agencies.

Mr. Somers founded the Lexington Law Group in 1996 and is a principal of the firm. Mr. Somers received his law degree from Hastings College of the Law and received a B.A. from Tulane University. While attending law school, Mr. Somers externed for the Honorable John P. Vukasin, Jr., United States District Court, Northern District of California.

Mark N. Todzo has devoted his practice of law to the representation of plaintiffs in antitrust, consumer and environmental protection litigation for over fifteen years. In that time, he has represented aggrieved individuals, nonprofit organizations and public entities in litigation that has curbed abusive and illegal corporate practices. Mr. Todzo's varied work has, among other things, helped to remove toxic chemicals from the environment, increased staffing in nursing homes, reformed deceptive advertising practices and recovered millions of dollars for the benefit of consumers. Mr. Todzo has argued cases in state and federal trial courts as well as courts of appeal and the California Supreme Court.

Mr. Todzo has served as class counsel in numerous class action lawsuits as well as liaison counsel in complex coordinated actions. He was recently lead counsel in a MDL case against Comcast on behalf of a class of subscribers who were blocked from using peer-to-peer file sharing programs. Mr. Todzo is currently representing classes of individuals in a variety of different cases, including an antitrust class action against Blue Shield seeking to recover increased health care payments for out of network charges.

Mr. Todzo joined the Lexington Law Group in 1998 and is a principal of the firm. Mr. Todzo received his law degree from Hastings College of the Law in 1993 and received a A.B. from Duke University in 1986.

Howard Hirsch has devoted his career to representing plaintiffs in public interest litigation to enforce consumer protections, conserve natural resources, and protect human health from toxic chemicals. After obtaining two years of training and experience at complex litigation with a large commercial law firm, Mr. Hirsch spent five years as a staff attorney at a national, non-profit environmental group representing individuals and other non-profits in citizen suits against polluters under the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, and other federal statutes. In that capacity, Mr. Hirsch helped secure the largest penalty ever assessed against a Pennsylvania polluter in a citizens' suit to date.

Mr. Hirsch joined the Lexington Law Group in 2003 and is a principal of the firm. Since joining LLG, Mr. Hirsch's practice has included significant experience litigating class actions against, among others, technology companies, airlines, and health care providers and insurers as well as enforcing California's Proposition 65. These cases have resulted in changes to deceptive business practices, substantial monetary recoveries for the benefit of consumers, and in

significant reductions in human exposures to toxic chemicals,. Mr. Hirsch has also volunteered his legal services to the homeless community of San Francisco and currently serves as a volunteer arbiter for the San Francisco Department of Human Services resolving disputes between homeless shelters and their residents.

Mr. Hirsch graduated from the University of California Berkeley Boalt Hall School of Law in 1996 and from Boston College in 1993.

Lisa Burger joined the Lexington Law Group as an associate in the Spring of 2008. Since earning her law degree from the University of Notre Dame Law in 2005, Ms. Burger has devoted her practice of law to exclusively representing plaintiffs in environmental, consumer protection, and civil rights litigation. Her current practice focuses on representing consumers in complex class action matters alleging antitrust and unfair and deceptive business practices.

Before joining Lexington Law Group, Ms. Burger was a litigation fellow with Disability Rights Advocates (DRA), a non-profit law center in Berkeley, California, that specializes in class action litigation on behalf of people with disabilities. As the David Boies / LD Access Fellow, Ms. Burger's practice focused on increasing access to standardized testing for people with learning disabilities and ADHD and involved nearly every aspect of civil litigation in both federal and state court.